

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,252 03/01/2000		03/01/2000	Patrick G Sobalvarro	3654-2	3759
826	7590	12/06/2005		EXAMINER	
ALSTO	N & BIRD	LLP	GARG, YOGESH C		
	F AMERIC.			ARTIBUT	DADED MUMPED
	101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			3625		

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action							
Before	the Filing o	of an Appeal	Brief				

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/516,252	SOBALVARRO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Yogesh C. Garg	3625		

7.40.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.	09/010,202	008/12///////021	/ NE.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Yogesh C. Garg	3625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of		a final rejection, whicheve	aria latar la ma				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 		educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment	t (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	•	, timely filed amendn	nent canceling				
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		vill be entered and an	explanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ovided below or appended.						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b	ut before or on the date of filing a N	Notice of Appeal will r	not be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	<u>-</u>		• •				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).	\neg				
10. LI Ottler	l	a max					
		Yogesh C Garg Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3625					
		ALCOING 0020					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

(i) The revised affidavit/declaration filed on 10/14/2005 is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Travis Publication reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The scope of the declaration or affidavit is not commensurate with the scope of the claim(s), that is defining an affinity space coordinate for each of a plurality of items available for sale, created package template including at least one mandatory element schema having an associated affinity space description, dynamically generating for sale by comparing, with a computer, the affinity space coordinate for each of the plurality of items with the affinity space description associated with the package templates and if the comparison step reveals a match presenting the dynamically generated package for sale, said package being defined at east in part by the package template and including at least one item with a matching affinity space coordinate.

The applicant, on page 2,in the third paragraph of the Declaration, has indicated that the package segment corresponds to affinity-space coordinate as exhibited on pages 20, 23, 25 and 31of Exhibit A and pages 17& 18 of Exhibit B but this fact is not supported by the applicant's disclosure. The applicant's specification filed on 3/1/2000 does not state or define categorically that the package segment are affinity space coordinates or vice-versa.

Also, the affidavit and the exhibits submitted does not show the following steps of:

defining an affinity space coordinate' and

dynamically generating for sale by comparing with a computer the affinity space coordinates for each of the plurality of items with the affinity space description associated with the package templates and if the comparison reveals a match presenting the dynamically generated package for sale.

(ii) The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Travis reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See Mergenthaler v. Scudder, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). In this case, the scope of the declaration or affidavit is not commensurate with the scope of the claim(s), that is defining an affinity space coordinate for each of a plurality of items available for sale, created package template including at least one mandatory element schema having an associated affinity space description, dynamically generating for sale by comparing, with a computer, the affinity space coordinate for each of the plurality of items with the affinity space description associated with the package templates and if the comparison step reveals a match presenting the dynamically generated package for sale, said package being defined at east in part by the package template and including at least one item with a matching affinity space coordinate.

The applicant, on page 2, in the third paragraph of the Declaration, has indicated that the package segment corresponds to affinity-space coordinate as exhibited on pages 20, 23, 25 and 31of Exhibit A and pages 17& 18 of Exhibit B but this fact is not supported by the applicant's disclosure. The applicant's specification filed on 3/1/2000 does not state or define categorically that the package segment are affinity space coordinates or vice-versa.

Also, the affidavit and the exhibits submitted does not show the following steps of:

defining an affinity space coordinate' and

dynamically generating for sale by comparing with a computer the affinity space coordinates for each of the plurality of items with the affinity space description associated with the package templates and if the comparison reveals a match presenting the dynamically generated package for sale.

(iii) The 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must contain an allegation that the acts relied upon to establish the date prior to the reference or activity were carried out in this country or in a NAFTA country or WTO member country. See 35 U.S.C. 104.